

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
LAFAYETTE DIVISION**

STATE OF ARIZONA ET AL

CASE NO. 6:22-CV-01130

VERSUS

JUDGE DAVID C. JOSEPH

MERRICK GARLAND ET AL

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE CAROL B.
WHITEHURST**

MINUTES OF COURT:

Motion Hearing

Date:	4/4/2023	Presiding: Judge David C. Joseph
Court Opened:	10:03 AM	Courtroom Deputy: Christina Chicola
Court Adjourned:	10:58 AM	Court Reporter: Cathleen Marquardt
Statistical Time:	00:55	Courtroom: CR1

APPEARANCES

Joseph Scott St John	For	All Plaintiffs
Jordan Bailey Redmon	For	All Plaintiffs
John S McLindon	For	Rozas & Associates Law Firm L L C, Movant
William P Quigley	For	Home is Here N O LA, Movant
Julia Long	For	Home is Here N O LA, Movant
Stephanie Teplin	For	Home is Here N O LA, Movant
Jessica Myers Vosburgh	For	Home is Here N O LA, Movant
Matthew Vogel	For	Innovation Law Lab, Movant

PROCEEDINGS

Case called for hearing regarding [114] Motion to Quash *Subpoenas to Rozas and Associates Law Firm, L.L.C.* by Rosas and Associates Law Firm, LLC, [122] Motion to Quash by Home is Here NOLA, Immigration Services and Legal Advocacy, Louisiana Advocates for Immigrants in Detention and the [1] Motion to Quash Third-Party Rule 45 Subpoena by Innovation Law Lab filed in related case 6:23-cv-0420.

IT IS ORDERED that the pending Motion to Substitute Matthew S. Vogel as Counsel for Innovation Law Lab (record document 19) in 6:23-cv-0420 is GRANTED.

The Court heard oral argument from all parties. For the reasons stated on the record, and because the Court finds it probable that, given the limited purpose of the ongoing discovery period, sufficient discovery can be obtained from the parties in this matter, the court will DEFER ruling on the pending Motions to Quash in this matter (Docs. 114 and

122) as well as the Motion to Quash (Doc. 1) in 6:23-cv-0420. The Court orders that compliance with the subpoenas issued by the Plaintiffs that are subject to the three Motions to Quash are STAYED pending further order of the Court.

The Court further ORDERED that Plaintiffs may file a motion with the Court to enforce the subpoenas within 60 days if sufficient information cannot be obtained from party discovery. In any such motion, Plaintiffs must list the specific types of documents requested from the third-party movants and the relevance and necessity of those documents with respect to Article III standing. The Court will then refer the matter to the Magistrate Judge to determine the scope of any required document production in consideration of the pending Motions to Quash.

A status conference will be set in due course with the federal defendants to discuss matters that took place in this hearing.